

Council

12 March 2013

Minutes

Present: Ms J Evans (Chair)
Mr A Bicknell
Mr M Draper
Professor B Gusterson
Ms K Horvers
Dr A Kent
Professor P Kopelman
Mr C North
Mr M Owen
Professor F Ross
Mr M Stevens
Ms C Swarbrick.
Mr G Turner
Professor J Weinberg
Mrs C Wilson
Professor Sir Nicholas Wright

Observer: Mr D Kennedy

In attendance: Mr M Bery, Chief Operating Officer
Mrs S Bowen, Secretary and Academic Registrar
Mrs W Brewer, Joint Director of Human Resources (SGHT & SGUL)
Professor G Hall, Chair, Safety Management Committee (Minute 51)
Ms S Trubshaw, Clerk to Council and Head of GLAS

Apologies for absence were received from Professor Patricia Hughes, Ms Gemma Hobcraft, Mr Christopher Smallwood and Mrs Cathy Wilson

Health and Safety

51. Health and Safety Issues

Received:

A report from the Safety Management Committee, also covering any issues that had arisen since the meeting of Council held on 11 December 2012.

Reported:

That there had been a major incident involving a fire on 2 January 2013. This had been caused by a faulty air conditioning unit situated in FHSCE on the second floor of Grosvenor Wing. It appeared that some staff had been reluctant to evacuate. It was agreed that the importance of complying with Health and Safety requirements, such as the evacuation of buildings, should be emphasised to all staff.

The Chair, thanked Professor George Hall, who was retiring at the end of April 2013, for his service to the Health and Safety Committee, and also to SGUL and SGHT.

Paper Council/4/A

52. Remarks from the Chair

Reported:

- (i) That Ms Maureen Boylan would be observing the Council meeting as part of the external Effectiveness Review of Council.
- (ii) That Mr James Cochrane, former member of SGUL Council, had been awarded the CBE in the New Year's Honours List.
- (iii) That the Chair would be completing her term of office at the end of the Summer and would not be undertaking a further term. Mrs Cathy Wilson, had agreed to Chair the Nominations Committee to undertake the appointment of a new Chair of Council.

53. Minutes

Considered and approved:

- (i) Minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2012 subject to the minor amendment of Minute 34 (ii) (a).

Paper Council/4/B
- (ii) Minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2012 subject to the addition of Mr D Kennedy, Professor B Gusterson, Ms K Horvers and Mrs W Brewer to the list of attendees.

Paper Council/4/C

54. Matters arising from the Minutes

- (i) Minute 8: Student Recruitment

Received:

A report on Student Recruitment for 2013 -2014 and the implications for a reduction in medical student numbers.

Reported:

That HEFCE had changed the rules governing the control of medical student numbers. From 2012, all new students, whichever year of study they entered would be included as 'new intake' and count towards the revised maximum funded places of 259. The maximum number of international students (not including INTO students) remained at 7.5% of the total, this equated to 19 out of the 259 places available.

As a result of the reduction in medical student numbers SPARC had agreed, at its meeting on 23 January 2013, the following proposals for entrance in 2013:

- That the 19 International students should remain within the 259 target
- That the route from BMS into T year would be maintained for c 20 students
- That negotiations would be undertaken to end/reduce the existing agreements for international students with Brunei, Taylors and IMU to provide for the directly recruited international places
- That any further required reduction would be balanced evenly between the MBBS4 and MBBS5 programmes.

Recruitment would be monitored and flexibility would be retained to adjust targets between programmes as recruitment progressed.

(ii) Minute 36 (ii): Hall Fees

Reported:

That the matter had been discussed at length at the Finance Committee. The fees had been carefully reviewed and market comparisons had been made. Following further modelling an increase of 7% had been agreed. This had been discussed with the Students' Union. It was noted that the halls would need to be used to the maximum including vacation letting to ensure that costs were covered and a surplus returned to SGUL.

Paper Council/4/D

Principal's Report

55. Report from the Principal

Received:

A report from the Principal.

Paper Council/4/E

Supporting the Strategic Plan

Key Items for Discussion

56. Research/Education Strategy (Restructuring)

Considered:

The proposed Research/Education Strategy.

Reported;

Research

That SGUL's research income had fallen by 25% over the last four years, and while it was acknowledged that the external funding environment was highly competitive, SGUL was underperforming relative to other institutions. SGUL's ranking for research spend using the 'Clinical Medicine 01' cost code showed that SGUL has fallen from 18th to 25th position since the financial year 2008-2009. Additionally the number of PGR students had not increased and was below competitors in terms of numbers of PGR students per fte.

A Research Away Day had been held on 2 October 2012, where detailed consideration had been given to the issues. Three key messages had emerged from the Away Day:

- (i) Links with the NHS, and the co-location with a multi-faculty teaching hospital would need to be exploited more fully.
- (ii) The current SGHT leadership were supportive of research and this was an important opportunity for SGUL.
- (iii) SGUL would need to be bold with regard to its research strategy and could not 'tinker around the edges'.

The Research Strategy had evolved since this meeting and had been discussed on three occasions at the Research Strategy Committee, including an extraordinary meeting, and it had also been discussed at Academic Forum and Senate, and was a regular item on the SPARC and Principal's Advisory Group (PAG) agendas. There had also been a well attended Principal's Open Forum, and further meetings were planned.

There were a number of areas to consider amongst these were:

- (1) Staff
- (2) Research Centres
- (3) Research Institutes
- (4) Teaching/Education

1. Staff

It would be important that staff within Research Institutes understood what was expected from them in terms of performance, and this should include specific targets. Typically these might be:

- For Research Staff this would be the achievement of annual research grant income of £200k and three or more PhD/MD students and a light amount of teaching.
- For teaching staff there would be no research grant targets, but it would still be possible to undertake research.
- For Research/Teaching staff the achievement of £65k per annum and one or more PhD/MD students.

The final agreed targets would be made clear to all staff, and would need to be addressed during performance management meetings each year. It was proposed that staff who fell below their targets would receive support and mentoring.

2. Research Centres

This would be the fundamental unit for research. The Principal Investigators within each Research Centre would be responsible for maintaining awareness of each others research, and also for mentoring of staff and postgraduate training activities. It was proposed that there should be some devolution of budgets to Research Centres which would allow flexibility. It was also proposed that there should be a light touch review each year and a major review every three years.

3. Research Institutes

Research Institutes would be the key change, and together with the Education Institute would replace the current Divisions. In particular the researchers from BMS would be integrated within the Institutes. The Research Institutes would also facilitate the exploitation of the clinical links with SGHT. The proposed Research Institutes were Infection and Immunity and Stroke and Cardiovascular. Each Institute would be made up of a number of Research Centres. There was also the possibility of the creation of a further Institute built around Epidemiology and Community Health.

In addition an Education Institute would be created which would potentially house the MBBS and BMS programmes, and educational research. The Education Institute would be able to commission teaching from the Research Institutes, this would allow the Research Institutes to derive some 'T' funding, in addition to research grant income and QR funding. It was proposed that the Research Institutes should be called the Jenner Institute and the Hunter Institute.

The Research Institutes would play a crucial role in improving and promoting external perceptions of SGUL amongst key funding bodies such as HEFCE, NIHR and Research Funding Councils. Strong leadership would be required for the two Research Institutes

4. Teaching/Education

It was felt that the creation of the three Institutes would allow funding to be distributed more effectively. There would be high level budgetary controls

allowing light touch management, with devolved budgets aligning influence with responsibility. Decisions would need to be made regarding the allocation of 'T' funding as noted in Section 3: Research Institutes above.

It was currently proposed that the Education Institute would house the MBBS and BMS programmes, together with Education Research.

The nature, amount and breadth of research activity outside the two research Institutes would become a decision that was devolved to the Head of the Education Institute and his/her team. This would be their expert view of what was needed to deliver high quality research informed educational programmes within the institute budget.

There was also a perception that 'Teachers' were seen as less important than researchers. It was felt that a framework that allowed promotion on the basis of teaching contribution to allow teachers to progress to the level of 'Reader' and 'Professor' should be developed.

5. Other Issues

It was suggested that there were a number of other questions that also needed consideration, including:

- Would teaching and research become too divorced?
- Would the new model make it more or less attractive to have a T & R contract?
- Would the new model improve financial sustainability?
- Was another restructure needed? What was the risk appetite?
- What was the risk of not restructuring?
- Were there external risks?
- How would the new model drive innovation and who would drive the process strategically?

The following points were noted:

- (i) That the resource requirements for the proposals had not been included. It was noted that that if Council endorsed the direction of travel that this would be the next step in developing the proposals.
- (ii) That it was felt to be inconceivable for SGUL to become a 'teaching only' institution, and that this would only precipitate a further drop in the league tables.
- (iii) That there should be an emphasis on the clinical interface with SGHT, building on the strengths of both SGUL and SGHT research.
- (iv) That it was likely 'T' income would be needed to underpin research, even with improved grant application success and the achievement of other research funding. It was felt that this should be clear at the outset.
- (v) That it was not clear why research at SGUL had declined in success in comparison to other HEIs. If there was an underlying problem this would need to be addressed, otherwise restructuring alone would not achieve the required improvements. Would a change of structure, change the behaviour of the staff?
- (vi) That a similar exercise had been carried out at QMUL Medical School. As a result staff who did not meet performance targets had left the institution. Following the re-organisation research income had risen from £17 million to £60 million.
- (vii) That the Chair of Council had received a letter from a number of academic staff in the Division of Biomedical Sciences (BMS) It was suggested that the staff in BMS might currently feel marginalised as the

restructuring effectively dissolved BMS. However, it was felt that the redistribution and integration of BMS research staff was crucial to the successful development of the proposed research institutes, and their ability to provide world class research.

- (viii) That the changes would not have an effect on the REF2014 submission but it was expected that it would make a considerable impact on the REF in 2020.
- (ix) That the Education Institute would provide a base for the BMS programme, and the need to provide and support BMS student projects was being taken into consideration in the development of the plans.
- (x) That it was felt that the timescales for restructuring would need to be made clear to staff as soon as possible.
- (xi) That the implementation of the strategy would be the key to success, and that there needed to be a clear implementation plan.
- (xii) That a number of issues including costings, risk assessment and an implementation plan would be discussed further at the Council Away Day on 26 April 2013.
- (xiii) That a communications strategy was currently being developed to support the changes.
- (xiv) That all the issues discussed above should be set out clearly in the 'case for change' including an options assessment.
- (xv) That measures should be put in place to maintain staff morale and ensure that it did not impact on the student experience or the current NSS return. In addition it was suggested that there should be a strategy for communications with the student body during the process of restructuring.

Summary

- (a) That the case had been well presented in particular the assessment of the current situation.
- (b) That there was general support in principle for the proposals subject to more detailed plans being considered at the Council Away Day.
- (c) That further consideration should be given to preserving the identity of BMS, acknowledging its contribution to SGUL, but without preventing change and transformation.

Agreed:

That the following would be provided for the Council Away Day:

- Case for Change
- Financial Costings
- Risk Analysis
- Implementation Plan

Paper Council/4/F

57. Workforce Strategy

Reported:

- (i) That this was the first report of its type to be produced for Council. The production of the report ([Appendix 1](#)) had highlighted a number of issues around the available data. A regular report would be produced which would allow for the

measurement of change over time. It was noted that there was currently some under reporting and measures were being taken to improve compliance.

- (ii) Appendix 2 detailed the merit awards and academic promotions for 2012. It was difficult to draw any conclusions because the numbers were small, but it would be possible to build up a further understanding of the data over time. An equal pay audit had been commissioned and the outcomes would be reported to Council.
- (iii) Appendix 3 set out the action that had been taken in response to the Staff Survey carried out in 2011. A further staff survey would be carried out at the end of the calendar year.
- (iv) Appendix 4 set out the Human Resources Strategy for 2012-2015. The strategy focussed on four key areas and supported the Institutional strategy. The areas were:
 - a. Performance Management
 - b. Gender Equality
 - c. Engaging with and motivating staff
 - d. Developing the Human Resources team to support the institutional strategy

Agreed:

That the Human Resource Strategy for 2012-2015 be approved.

Paper Council/4/G

58. Revision of the scheme and Statutes

Received:

The second progress report from the Scheme and Statutes Steering Group.

Reported;

- (a) That the Scheme and Statutes Steering Group had met on two further occasions since the first report to SPARC in December 2012.
- (b) That the recommendations in the first report had been agreed by SPARC, Senate, Academic Forum and Council.
- (c) That a number of action points contained in the report had also been taken forward including the appointment of a Deputy Principal (Minute 69 refers) and the inclusion of the SU President in the Group for matters relating to the Students' Union.
- (d) That the issue regarding the inclusion of the Academic Forum within the Statutes remained outstanding, and it had been agreed that a final decision would be made later in the session when the effect of the new Chair's measures to reinvigorate the Academic Forum could be reviewed.
- (e) That the Statutes included a list of 'Members of SGUL'. Following the transfer of the School of Education to the Faculty of Health and Social Care Sciences (now the Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education (FHSCE)) the Group had agreed that a clearer definition of members of staff within FHSCE who were members of SGUL should be found and included. It had been suggested that the definition 'staff in FHSCE covered by the Joint Venture Agreement' might be used and consultation with the Dean of FHSCE would be undertaken.
- (f) That a range of other more minor amendments had been made to the Scheme and Statutes to reflect current law and practice. Copies were available from Susan Trubshaw, Head of Governance, Legal and Assurance Services on request.

- (g) That the Statutory position of SGUL had been confirmed following research within the archives of the University of London. The resolution to approve the scheme of St George's Hospital Medical School pursuant to Section 15 of the NHS Act 1946 had been found in the minutes of the Court, the then governing body of the University of London (7 July 1948). It had been concluded on the basis of the evidence that SGUL was duly created as a body corporate as a result of the adoption of the Scheme.
- (h) That consultation with the Trade Unions was currently underway with regard to Statute 26 and the supporting policies.

Paper Council/4/H

The Student Experience

59. Report from the Students' Union

Received:

A report from the President of the Students' Union.

Reported;

That the Chair thanked the President of the Students' Union for the written report which was helpful and informative.

Paper Council/4/I

60. Internal Student Satisfaction Survey

Received;

A report on the Internal Student Satisfaction Survey.

Reported:

That the internal Student Satisfaction Survey was completed by non-final year students and covered a range of experiences, including and beyond, academic matters. There had been a good response to the survey, which was double the response of the previous year. Course Directors had been sent the full dataset and narrative comments for their course as appropriate, and they have been asked to provide feedback to the NSS Working Group.

Paper Council/4/J

61. NSS Action Plan

Received:

A report on progress with implementing the NSS Action Plan.

Reported:

- (i) That the 2013 NSS was now underway.
- (ii) That progress with implementing the 2012 Action Plan was continuing. The Students' Union had been active in assisting with the implementation of the action plan.

Paper Council/4/K

Partnerships

62. Memorandum of Understanding

Considered:

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between SGHT, SGUL and King's Health Partners.

Reported:

That as set out in Paragraph 5 of the covering paper it was noted the MOU had arisen from the need for 'St George's' (SGUL and SGHT) to develop a significant presence in the new NHS landscape. This included a close collaborative arrangement with an AHSC. Given the geographical basis of the three London AHSCs, discussions over a number of months had been conducted with King's Health Partners, rather than Imperial College Health Partners or UCL Partners. The MOU reflected a desire of all parties to work more closely together. SGUL was also committed to maintaining its existing valued and long-term collaborative relationships, including those with Kingston University, with whom it shared the Faculty of Health, Social Care and Education, and the South West London Academic, Health and Social Care System. The strategic alliance with KHP was being pursued in the belief that it would strengthen these relationships.

It was noted that the KHP AHSC would be re-accredited in 2014, and that St George's wished to be part of this process. The MOU allowed for participation in Board meetings, which in turn allowed for direct input into current plans and future strategy. The MOU would also be approved by the Trust Board and the KHP Board. It was suggested that a communications plan was required to allay fears by staff that this was a 'take over' bid by King's College, particularly during the current discussions with regard to restructuring.

Agreed:

That the MOU was approved subject to careful monitoring of the benefits of the arrangement.

Paper Council/4/L

63. International Developments

Received:

(i) A report on International Developments.

Paper Council/4/M

(ii) Minutes of the International Committee, the INTO/St George's Joint Venture Board and the University of Nicosia Steering Group were reported to SPARC on 23 January 2013 and 20 February 2013 and are available to Council Members on request.

Reported:

That the Student body was keen to learn more about international developments, and it was hoped that there would be further communication possibly through the Deans' Letter or future student open forums.

KPIs & Finance

64. Key Performance Indicators

Received:

The Key Performance Indicators.

Reported;

That the KPIs reflected the matters that had been discussed earlier in the meeting. Additional supporting data was available to Council members on request.

Paper Council/4/N

65. Financial Report

Received:

A report on financial matters including the revised forecast for 2012-2013.

Reported:

That Finance Committee had agreed that £5 million in cash should be invested, as there was currently an improvement in the markets.

Paper Council/4/O

STATUTORY DUTIES

Audit

66. Audit Committee

Received:

A report from the Chair of the Audit Committee.

Reported:

That the Audit Committee had conducted its own Effectiveness Review which had instigated a useful discussion with regard to Risk Management, and to creating a space within the agenda to discuss current HE issues. The Audit Committee had received a presentation on risk from Deloitte which had been interesting and had raised some issues around risk appetite.

Paper Council/4/P

67. Risk Management and Efficiency Committee

Received:

- (i) The Summary Risk Register
- (ii) The Key Risk Indicator Table and commentary on changes to the risk scores following the meeting of the Risk Management and Efficiency Committee on 15 February 2012.

Paper Council/4/Q

Matters for Approval

68. Honorary Awards

Considered and approved:

The recommendations of the Nominations and Honorary Awards Committee, for Honorary Awards:

Honorary Degrees (DSc (Med))

Dr Patricia Hamilton
Professor Sir Sabaratnam Arulkumaran (Emeritus Professor)
Dr Jacky Hayden

Honorary Fellowships

Mr James Cochrane, CBE
Professor Joe Collier (Emeritus Professor)

69. Appointment of Deputy Principal

Approved:

The appointment of Professor Adrian Clark as Deputy Principal in accordance with Statute 5 (e) and Statute 16.

70. Appointment of Clerk to Council

Approved:

The appointment of Ms Susan Trubshaw as Clerk to Council in accordance with Statute 5 (e).

71. Policy for the Use of the Common Seal

Approved:

The Policy for the Use of the Common Seal.

Paper Council/4/R

72. Conferment of Title

Approved:

Following a recommendation by the Chair, on behalf of Senate, the conferment of the title of Emeritus Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology on Professor Sir Sabaratnum Arulkumaran with effect from 17 January 2013.

HEFCE and other External Matters

73. HEFCE Letters and Consultations and other External Consultations for Information

Received:

A report on HEFCE letters and consultations and other external consultations, with responses to date.

Paper Council/4/S

Matters for Report

74. Minutes of Meetings

Committee	Date of Meeting	Available from:
Audit Committee	26 February 2013	By email from s.trubshaw@sgul.ac.uk
Risk Management Committee	13 February 2013	By email from s.durkin@sgul.ac.uk
Finance Committee	28 February 2013	Paper Council/4/T
SPARC	12 December 2012 23 January 2013 20 February 2013	By email from s.trubshaw@sgul.ac.uk
Senate	25 February 2013	By email from d.baldwinson@sgul.ac.uk
Human Resources Committee		By email from jmaughan@sgul.ac.uk

75. Dates of meetings 2012-2014

Friday 26 April 2013 – Away Day – London Mathematical Society, De Morgan House, 57-58, Russell Square (behind Senate House).

Tuesday 9 July 2013

Tuesday 22 October 2013

Tuesday 26 November 2013

Tuesday 17 December 2013

Tuesday 18 March 2014

Friday 11 April 2014 – Away Day – Venue to be confirmed

Tuesday 8 July 2014

Tuesday 21 October 2014

Tuesday 25 November 2014

Tuesday 16 December 2014

ST/20 March 2013